1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	EDWARD E. SEELY,	3:08-CV-125-RCJ(RAM)
9	Plaintiff,	ORDER
10	V.	ORDER
11	JIM GIBBONS, et al.,	
12	Defendants.	
13		!
14	Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Relief from Judgment/Orde	
15	#158(#191) filed on February 12, 2010. Defendants filed their Opposition to Plaintiff's Relief	
16	From Judgment or Order (#192) on February 22, 2010.	
17	In this motion, Seely requests relief from judgment in this case, but offers no new lega	
18	or factual argument justifying reconsideration. Upon considering Seely's arguments, al	
19	records on file and the relevant law, the court finds no basis to reconsider the Courts	
20	Order(#158) or Judgment (#159) entered on October 23, 2009.	
21	Legal Standard	
22	Motions to reconsider are generally avoided. See e.g., United States v. Mills, 810 F.20	
23	907, 909 (9th Cir. 1987) (stating that "[t]he law of the case doctrine provides that in order to	
24	maintain consistency during the course of a single case, reconsideration of questions	
25	previously decided should be avoided."); see also Earl Old Person v. Brown, 312 F.3d 1036	
26	1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (stating that exceptions to the law of the case doctrine include the	
27	following: (1) the prior decision is clearly erroneous and its enforcement would work a manifes	
28	injustice: (2) intervening controlling authority: and (3) substantially different evidence). That	

Case 3:08-cv-00125-RCJ-RAM Document 220 Filed 08/12/10 Page 1 of 2

notwithstanding, Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) provides that "[o]n motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party . . . from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect"

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Seely's Motion Requesting Relief from Judgment/Order #158(#191) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: This 12th day of August, 2010.

ROBERT C. ONES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE